

Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the Application.

LISTING OF CLAIMS:

95. (*Currently Amended*) A computer-implemented method for measuring the relative accuracy of multiple analysts' estimates at one or more points in time for one or more events, the method comprising ~~the steps of~~:

generating, for each of the multiple analysts, for one or more events, at one or more points in time, a relative accuracy score by comparing the accuracy of an analyst's estimate for an event at a point in time relative to the average accuracy of the estimates for analysts having estimates for the event at that point in time; and

generating individual relative accuracy ratings for each of the multiple analysts, for one or more events.

96. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 95, wherein the point in time comprises a given day, and wherein generating step a relative accuracy score further comprises the step of generating a relative accuracy score for each analyst for ~~a~~ the given day by providing a numerator that compares an analyst's error on ~~a~~ the given day with the average analyst error on that day and providing a denominator that normalizes the numerator.

97. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 96, wherein the numerator comprises the difference between an analyst's absolute error in an estimate and the average absolute error among a plurality of analysts' estimates.

Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005

98. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 96, wherein the denominator comprises a function of a plurality of values to ~~insure~~ ensure that the relative accuracy rating is normalized in proportion to a plurality of factors to meaningfully compare relative accuracy scores.

99. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 96, wherein ~~the normalizing step-normalizes normalization comprises normalizing~~ the relative accuracy score around a neutral value.

100. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 99, wherein the neutral value corresponds to the average absolute error among a number of analysts.

101. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 95, further comprising the step of aggregating the relative accuracy score for an analyst over more than one day point in time for a period of time, for a single event, to generate an analyst event score.

102. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 101, further comprising ~~the step of~~, if an analyst does not have an estimate for a given day point in time in the period of time, assigning a central relative accuracy score for that analyst for that day point in time.

103. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 101, wherein an analyst event score is capped within a range to enable more meaningful comparison with other analyst event scores.

Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005

104. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 95, wherein the point in time comprises a given day, and further comprising step of measuring an analyst's accuracy for an event further comprises the step of measuring the difference between the an analyst's absolute error for an estimate for the an event on -a- the given day and the average absolute error among all analysts providing estimates on that given day for the event.

105. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 95, wherein the estimate is an earnings estimate.

106. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 101, wherein the method a point in time comprises a day, and further comprising determining a relative accuracy score for a plurality of analysts for each day over a number of days prior to an event report to generate a daily relative accuracy score for the analysts and taking a weighted average of the daily relative accuracy scores for an analyst to generate an aggregated relative accuracy score for the analyst for the event.

107. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 106 95, further comprising the step of multiplying the aggregated relative accuracy score for a number of events for an analyst by a function of the number of events aggregating multiple relative accuracy scores for one analyst for one security for multiple events.

Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005

108. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 107, wherein the method comprises the step of further comprising multiplying the aggregated relative accuracy score less a neutral value by an inflation factor then adding back the neutral value.

109. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 106, wherein when an estimate is not available or a relative accuracy score is not meaningfully calculable on a given day, replacing that days day's value with a neutral value.

110. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 109, wherein the neutral value is a value about which the relative accuracy scores are normalized.

111. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 107 106, wherein the weighting is equal for each day.

112. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 107 106, wherein the weighting for some days is greater than other days.

113. (*cancelled*)

114. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 107, wherein the relative accuracy scores for events are truncated to lie within a predetermined range.

Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005

115. (*cancelled*)

116. (*cancelled*)

117. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 95 107, further comprising a method for aggregating relative accuracy event scores, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a number (N) of single events for which there are relative accuracy scores to be aggregated;

taking the average (A) of the single event relative accuracy scores over the ~~N~~ (N) events;

taking the difference between the average (A) and a ~~center~~ neutral value for a range;

multiplying the difference (D) by a function f(n); and

adding the ~~center~~ neutral value to the multiplied difference.

118. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 117, wherein the function f(n) comprises multiplying by a root of N.

119. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 117, wherein the function f(n) comprises multiplying by the square root of N.

120. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 96, wherein the denominator is determined by selecting a maximum value from a plurality of values.

**Application Serial No.: 09/982,838
Attorney Docket No. 089070-0311376 (23449-020)
In Response to Office Action mailed March 25, 2005**

121. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the standard deviation of analysts' estimates on a day.

122. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the average absolute error of analysts on a day.

123. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a number based on the absolute value of the actual event value.

124. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 120, wherein the plurality of values comprises a constant monetary value.

125. (*Currently Amended*) The method of claim 95, further comprising ~~a step of~~ mapping the relative accuracy scores to an accuracy rating system, wherein ~~an~~ a relative accuracy score that falls within a predetermined range of relative accuracy scores is assigned an accuracy rating corresponding to that range, and the accuracy rating has corresponding symbols, where the number of symbols signifies the relative accuracy of an analyst.

126. (*Previously Presented*) The method of claim 125, where the ratings range from 1-5 and the symbols comprise stars.